# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

#### MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE

In re:	
Von Ro Corporation	ch. 7 case no. 13-34910
Debtor,	
Stephen J. Creasey, Trustee,	
Plaintiff	
vs.	
Mark J. Mimbach, M.J. Mimbach, Inc.; Spire Credit Union f.k.a Greater Minnesota Credit Union, and John Doe 1-x, ABC Corp,	adv. no. 14-03162
Affidavit	of Movant
I, Samuel V. Calvert, an active member in good standing of the bar of the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota, request that this Court admit pro hac vice, Christopher LaNave who will be counsel for the defendants Mark J. Mimbach and MJ Mimbach, Inc. in the case listed above.	
Check one of the following:	
X I am a resident of the State of Minnesota and the presentation of the case above and as by LR 83.5(d) (sign and complete informat	ccept service of all papers served as required
I am not a resident of the State of Minne as local counsel under LR 83.5(d). I agree to presentation of the case listed above, and according to the case listed above.	· -

by LR 83.5(d) should my motion for a non-resident to serve as local counsel be granted by the court (sign and complete information below and attach a completed Motion for

Permission for a Non-Resident to Serve as Local Counsel).

NOTE: Neither Mark Mimbach nor M. J. Mimbach Inc. have retained Sam Calvert or Christopher A. LaNave as of the date of this motion. If the motion is granted, then Mark Mimbach and M. J. Mimbach Inc. will retain Christopher A. LaNave as lead counsel and Sam Calvert as local counsel. Sam Calvert states that his involvement in this matter will be limited in scope according to the retainer agreement Sam Calvert will sign with Mark Mimbach and M. J. Mimbach Inc., which limited scope of local counsel for pro hac vice attorneys has been recognized in Macawber Engineering, Inc. v. Robson & Miller, 47 F.3d 253, 257 (8th Cir. 1995)

Signature:

Sam V. Calvert

Attorney License #: 1431X

Date: 29-18

Date: 3/4/15

### Affidavit of Proposed Admittee

I, Christopher A. LaNave, am currently a member in good standing of the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, but am not admitted to the bar of this court. I understand that if this Court grants me admission pro hac vice, the moving attorney identified in this motion must participate in the preparation and presentation of the case listed above, and must accept service of all papers served as required by LR 83.5(d). I further understand that the District of Minnesota is an electronic court and that I consent to service required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 77 by electronic means and I understand that electronic notice will be in lieu of service by mail unless the Court learns that a failure has occurred in which case service will be effected by mail within 24 hours.

Typed Name: Christopher A. LaNave

Attorney License Number: 165340, issued by the State of CA.

Law Firm Name: Law Offices of Christopher A. LaNave

Law Firm Address: 501 W. St. Germain St. #300, St. Cloud, MN 56301

Main phone:320-492-5492

Direct line: same

# Christopher A. LaNave

## Attorney at Law

Licensed Only In California

March 2, 2015

13-34910

US. Bankruptcy Court 200 Warren E. Burger Federal Building and United States Courthouse 316 North Robert Street St. Paul, MN 55101 501 W. St. Germain St. 300 St. Cloud, MN 56301 Telephone (320) 492-5492 clglobal@aol.com

RE: In Re: Von Ro Corporation, Debtor, Stephen J. Creasey, Trustee, Plaintiff v. Mark J. Mimbach; et al, BKY. No.13-34910, ADV. No.14-03163

#### Dear Sir/Madam:

In addition to the Application for Admission Pro Hac Vice that is being submitted by Samuel V. Calvert, there are two items I wanted to address.

The first is that I am a resident of Minnesota. US District Court local rule 83.5 refers to admission of attorneys pro hac vice who are "Non-Resident(s)" of Minnesota. About five or so years ago, I applied for pro hac vice admission on a US District Court in Minnesota and advised that I was a resident of Minnesota. I was allowed to appear in that case, Murrins v. Fischer et al.07-1295.

The second is that I do not recall whether it came out in the case I testified in about 4 years or so ago, which Judge Kishel presided over so I am restating/stating it here. The state court judgment that was entered against me, which I appealed, was vacated by the district court judge who had entered the judgment prior to the appeal going to its conclusion.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Christopher A. LaNave